Series IX, Number 4

# WHAT THE BIBLE REALLY IS

An Address
Delivered Before the First Unitarian Society of Minneapolis, Sunday Morning, November 8, 1925, by the Minister, John H. Dietrich.

*Price Five Cents*
*By Mail Ten Cents*

Published by
THE LAYMEN'S LEAGUE
803 La Salle Avenue
Minneapolis, Minn.

The Minister of the First Unitarian Society of Minneapolis, is granted absolute freedom of thought and speech. The Sunday morning addresses are the expressions of his individual conviction, and he alone is responsible for them.

In order to meet the desires of a number of friends and members of this congregation who reside out of the city, who wish to receive copies of the published addresses, weekly bulletins, etc., the Board of Trustees has authorized the formation of a mailing list on which the names of all persons desiring to become associate members of the Society will be carried upon the payment of $2.00 per year, or the payment of $1.00 per year, in case the addresses alone are desired. One address is published each month during the church year from September to June, or a series of ten numbers.

Additional copies of this pamphlet may be procured from the Publication Committee, 803 La Salle Avenue, Minneapolis, Minn. Price, 10c each by mail.

# What the Bible Really Is

Our subject today is the third in the series on the "Great Alternative—Orthodox Christianity or Humanistic Liberalism." We first discussed what I called the "Parting of the Ways," outlining for you the two methods of study and interpretation employed by these different types of religion—one known as the traditional which postulates a theory and then interprets facts and human experience in the light of that theory; the other known as the scientific which studies facts and human experience and then postulates such theories as this study suggests. The former accepts as truth that which is believed to have been revealed by God, the latter accepts as truth or knowledge that which has been discovered by the inquiring mind of man. Now these two theories when patiently and consistently followed lead people to very different conclusions on all the important ideas which form the content of religious thought. Last Sunday we discussed the first of these ideas—the idea of God. I told you that we must remember two things when contemplating the idea of God—first that we distinguish between the symbol and the reality which that symbol represents, that every concept of God which man ever has or ever can form is merely a symbol of the great reality which our minds are unable to grasp; and secondly, that the symbol which the Humanist feels is more in harmony with this scientific and democratic age is that of the spirt of humanity rather than a personal individual existing outside of humanity. Humanism thinks of some unseen power at work in the world, but it insists that this power works through the serving people of the world rather than through some ruling person outside of the world. This is the thought which I sought to elaborate and make plain to you in our last study.

Today we are to discuss the different conceptions of the Bible which are held by these two different and opposite types of religion. The word "Bible" as you know simply means book. The Bible is **the** book, the book that in a peculiar manner discloses the thought and the will of God. I told you several weeks ago that among those ideas which are common to all religions is the idea of Revelation. Every religion takes as its fundamental idea —God, and the very next thought is that of the revelation of God. God must reveal himself somehow and somewhere and somewhen. A god which conceals himself entirely would hardly be a God. From the beginning of time,

all over the earth, the cry has gone up for God to reveal himself. Men have pled for the spoken voice, for the written word, for an intelligible communication which could not be mistaken, as coming from their God. Now such a revelation people claim to have in their bibles. Every religion above that of the savage has its bible. The Chinese pay homage to the wise words of Confucius; the Brahmins prize their Vedas; the Buddhists venerate their Pitikas and many other scriptures in Sanscrit; the Zoroastrians cherish their Zend Avesta; the Scandinavians their Eddas; the Greeks their oracles and the songs of their mighty bards. The books of the Old Testament constitute the bible of the Hebrews, and these in addition to the books of the New Testament constitute the bible of the Christians. To each race and religion, its own bible is believed to be the best, because intelligible to it, because most in sympathy with its genius; and as time goes on each religion comes to look upon its bible as the very word of God, and the only word of God, all other bibles being but false pretensions.

And of course this is the attitude which Christians hold in regard to their bible, composed of the books which make up the Old and New Testaments. It is to them a sacred book, written by men who were directly inspired by God; and, therefore, it contains the very word of God, in its purity and completeness, and teaches the infallible truth in regard to the origin and nature of the world and of man, and is an unerring guide to human conduct. This theory in its logical form makes the Bible the standard of all truth and knowledge; and the people who hold this theory and apply it consistently are bound to accept only such findings of modern science as are substantiated by Bible texts, as well as make the teachings of the Bible the standard of their moral conduct. And, of course, this is why the problem of "What the Bible really is," is perhaps the most important problem which we have to meet at this present time. For the Bible, you must remember, is the key-point of this modern theological controversy. It may take the form of an attack upon evolution, but the heart of it is the Bible. In fact, the sole reason for the attack upon evolution is the fact that it contradicts the Bible in certain important respects. The Fundamentalist movement, and indeed orthodox Christianity, stands or falls according to the theory of the origin, the nature and the authority of the Bible.

And not only that, but it is important that we as individuals should have a conviction in this regard. If, indeed, this book be, as is claimed, the word of God; if its

conceptions of God and man and morality and religion are the unchanging truth, then there is nothing so important as that we should know it, and that we should act upon it every day of our lives. On the other hand, if this claim be not true, then the claim itself is vicious and injurious to man, and stands in the way of human progress. For example, suppose a ship at sea; the captain has a chart which he believes to be accurate in every detail. He has a compass, the needle of which he believes always points north. If they be what he suppose, then of course they will help him, and it is of the utmost importance that he know it and act accordingly; but if the chart be inaccurate, if the compass be untrue, then to trust in them will surely lead him astray and maybe cause disaster and ship wreck. Just so, if the Bible conception of God be true, it is very important that we know it; but if it is not true, then we may in our religious conceptions be led astray. If the Bible teaching concerning man, his origin and nature be false, and we believe it, then it must stand in the way of the right solution of our human problems. If the Bible doctrine concerning the destiny of the race be untrue, then we are leading humanity on a false road which is taking us farther and farther every day from the real goal. I insist then that to accept the Christian claim in regard to the bible is not an innocent belief, a harmless faith. It is something that stands squarely in the way of human progress, more than anything else of which I know. We need, therefore, earnestly and simply, without prejudice and without passion, to ask and answer this grave question in the light of all the knowledge and help that we can obtain. And let it be understood that I have no prejudice against a revelation. On the contrary, I would welcome an infallible guide through the maze of life. So whatever I may say in the course of this discussion, do not think that I am influenced by any antagonism to the revelation idea itself. I have no desire whatever either to attack or find fault with the idea. My only desire is to know whether or not the Bible is such a revelation, in order that I may not be deceived. And I think probably the best approach to an answer for this question is to look briefly over the history and findings of the application of the scientific and historical method to the study of the Bible.

## I

For hundreds of years, the Bible, as the precious word of God, was kept secret by the priests of the Christian church, who read only such portions of it to the people as they considered essential to their needs, and who forbade those outside the priesthood to read it for themselves

or even to possess a copy. During all this time, the Bible was translated only into the Greek and Latin; and until the sixteenth century, when it was rendered into the language of the people, it remained a sealed book to mankind at large. All these years, the people never questioned the truth of the stories it contained concerning the creation, the fall of man, and so forth. At the end of the fifteenth century, however, dawning science brought proof that the teachings of the Bible were at variance with the facts ascertained about nature. Copernicus now discovered that the earth was not the center of the universe. This discovery was confirmed by the further investigations of Kepler and Galileo. The Christian church, represented by its powerful priesthood, refused to admit the truth of the new doctrine, and persecuted the discoverers. But in the eighteenth century, scientific knowledge steadily increased, and by the early nineteenth century, the creation and flood stories were disproved by the incontestible discoveries of geology; and the culminating discovery which came with Darwin and Huxley, whereby the doctrine of evolution was established, made the truth of these stories no longer defensible.

During this growth of science and its discoveries, intellectual men gradually became convinced that the statements in the Bible were disproved by the known facts of nature, and that the only way in which truth could be ascertained was by reasoning it out from the discoveries of science, which are based upon careful observation and comparison. Thus was applied slowly but steadily the scientific method to all branches of knowledge. This method was finally extended even to the study of such matters as the origin and nature of sacred writings. By the study of primitive races and their beliefs, it was found that much of the teachings of all scriptures, including the Bible, embodied the crude ideas, myths and traditions of peoples who had not reached beyond guessing and using their imaginations. In the case of the Bible, learned men, who realized that the principles which were applicable to other scriptures could be directed to the Christian sacred books, began to investigate its origin and to ascertain how it grew into the collection of writings that it finally became. All of this was not accomplished without bitter opposition, during which the truth has slowly gained ground, and those interested in retarding it have been forced gradually to retire, like a beaten army from one position to another, as I shall show in detail in a few moments—first holding the only logical theory of Verbal inspiration, followed by that of Plenary inspiration, this in turn followed by the belief that the Bible is the word

of God only in religious matters, and all the way down to that strange theory that the Bible is not the word of God, but that it is in some mysterious sense different from all other books.

Of course, the general public knows little or nothing of the results of this Biblical criticism. Why should they? Not only do they deem it a dull subject, but those who attend church are being informed from the pulpit that "the Bible has been battered by centuries of criticism, but has come out of it stronger than ever." It is easy enough to make statements of this kind; and doubtless they serve temporarily to quiet the fears of a congregation who know very little of the subject, and are only too glad to believe what they are told so authoritatively; but unfortunately such statements, to put it mildly, are misleading. The ordinary man is woefully ignorant of the higher criticism. His ideas of Bible difficulties are mostly confined to common sense. He knows perhaps that scoffers of the free-thinking type and so-called infidel lecturers ridicule the Bible, and he himself may have made fun of some passages that appear absurd; but here his knowledge of Biblical criticism ceases. He is not aware that the critics are a body of the most erudite experts in theology, whose only motive for offering their opinion is to give the world the truth.

## II

Now I have no time this morning to do what I have done for you before; that is, show the various steps of progress made in the historical and scientific study of the Bible, and give you the reasons why modern scholarship has found it necessary as a result of this study to surrender entirely the belief that the Bible is the word of God. I have not time to show you that this method applied to a careful scrutiny of the text, as it has been preserved through the ages, demonstrates very clearly that even though it had been the word of God in the beginning, there is no assurance that it is the word of God today, because it has been subject to constant change and variation through the copyists and translators, so that today there are more than 150,000 differences in the various texts of this collection of books. Neither have I time to show by the hundreds of contradictions, inconsistencies, and anachronisms that it could not possibly be the word of a single being, God or man, who was sane and rational. What I am interested in in this series of addresses is to contrast for you the theories held by orthodox Christianity and by Humanistic Liberalism, and show you that we must choose one or the other, that there is no logical

middle ground upon which a rational man may stand. Here as in our previous discussions, we must adopt the philosophy of "Either-or" and not that of "Both-and." Either the Bible is the infallible word of God or else it is the fallible word of men. It cannot be half one and half the other. No patchwork of the two theories can possibly appeal to a logical mind.

In order to show you this contrast as well as the cloudiness with which people's thinking envelopes the Bible, let me outline for you the logical attitudes of the orthodox Christian and of the Humanistic Liberal, and the illogical attitudes of the majority of people who are neither one nor the other. And this I want you to note is extremely important, for it is the theories about the Bible that have caused all the mischief in the world. There is nothing wrong with the Bible any more than with any other collection of literature if we take the Bible for what it really is. It then stands on its own bottom, and is considered good or bad according to the good or bad it contains. The eternal mischief is wrought by removing the Bible from the ordinary rules of criticism, by placing it on a pedestal, and making men worship it as the actual word of an infinite God, when in reality it is only the natural literature of a crude and superstitious people.

The original attitude toward the Bible by orthodox Protestantism was the theory of Verbal Inspiration. This is the theory held today by the Fundamentalists, and to my mind the only logical theory if one is to accept the Bible as the word of God. According to this theory, it is believed that every word, as it appeared in the original Hebrew and Greek manuscripts was directly inspired by God; so that it was as literally God's word as though he had himself held the pen, and had chosen those words and no others. This theory was carried so far by the Puritans that some actually believed that not only the words, but the punctuation points were inspired. That makes you smile; and yet if you consider a little, you will see that it is an essential part of the theory. You know how possible it is to change the sense of a passage in a letter or book by changing the punctuation. If not, let me illustrate by a story which I once told you in a different connection, because it applies with unusual aptness to this interesting point. It is a story about these Twin Cities In those days there was great rivalry between St. Paul and Minneapolis as desirable places in which to live. There were two friends, one living in each city; and the Minneapolis resident was constantly talking about the benefits of his city until he finally persuaded the man living in St. Paul to move across the river. This man had a daugh-

ter about twelve years old, who as they packed up to leave, wrote a note and left it in the old St. Paul house. Her father found the note and showed it to the Minneapolis man, and said, "You see even my little girl recognizes the mistake we are making. Here she has written a note, saying, 'Good-by God, we are moving to Minneapolis.'" The other man looked at the note a moment and then replied, "No, you have not read that right. The note reads, 'Good, by God, we are moving to Minneapolis.'" Thus you will see that a sentence may mean directly opposite things by the shifting of a comma; and so in order to be consistent and logical this theory of Verbal Inspiration must include the placing of the punctuation points as well as the choice of the words. This, remember, is the real orthodox view of the Bible, which to my mind is the only alternative to the real liberal's position, which I shall outline presently. In the meantime, let me explain several other theories which are held by people who claim to be orthodox, and show you how untenable each is to one who thinks accurately and soundly.

Another theory which has been more commonly held among evangelical Christians, and the one generally held today by those who call themselves orthodox, but not Fundamentalists, is known as Plenary Inspiration, from the Latin word meaning full or complete. These people do not insist upon the very words and punctuation marks of the text; but they hold and teach that the human writers of the original manuscripts were so divinely controlled as to preclude them from the possibility of any mistakes so that the Bible in every part is completely true and contains absolutely no error. This is the theory of Plenary Inspiration, and does not differ very much from that of Verbal Inspiration in substance, although the latter is without doubt more consistent and logical.

Another theory is the one held by orthodox people who are inclined to be a little liberal. It insists that the Bible is a religious book, and therefore not intended to teach science. It teaches that though the Bible may be in error in regard to scientific matters, it may contain mistakes as to historical facts, may be wrong in its figures, still it is true and the infallible word of God in its moral and religious teachings. One of the best illustrations of this attitude is to be found in Dr. Jefferson of the Broadway Tabernacle in New York, who recently said in a sermon on the Bible, "The Christian church is coming to see that the Bible is not a book of science. There are different spheres of knowledge and the Bible is supreme in only one of them. The men who wrote the scriptures knew nothing of science as we know it today. It is because

men have insisted that the Bible does teach science that there has been so much conflict between science and religion. All sorts of expedients have been adopted to harmonize science with religion, Genesis with geology; but all these attempts have failed, and all such attempts must forever fail, for the Bible is not a book of science, but a book of religion." This theory, of course, is the result of the pressure brought to bear upon the situation by the modern study of science and history, which have actually disproved much Biblical data; and marks the gradual retreat of the theologian. And while this seems to be an impossible position, it is difficult to disprove it; because they claim for the Bible authority only in those realms which do not lend themselves to proof. The theory, of course, amounts to this—where things in the Bible lend themselves to scientific tests, they are not necessarily true; but where it is impossible to test them, they are the infallible word of God.

There is still another theory held by people who claim to be orthodox, but who are a little more liberal than those who hold the last named theory. These would not point out any particular text and say this is the absolute and infallible word of God, while this other is error. They do not say the Bible is the word of God; but they change the phrase and say that it **contains** the word of God. When I was in this stage of development, just before I emerged, or should say was ejected, from the orthodox church, I used the phrase that the Bible contains the truth of God and the errors of men, such errors being made by their inability to receive the full revelation. And this seems to be the view held by Dr. Fosdick in his recent book, "The Modern Use of the Bible," in which he speaks of the fact that revelation is limited according to the capacity of the one receiving the revelation, and that is why he tells us that some books are of greater authority than others in the Bible, because some men, as for instance, John and Paul, were capable of grasping more of the revelation of God than others, for instance, Moses and Joshua. Of course, the trouble with this theory is the difficulty in determining which is the word of God and which the human misconception. And in the last analysis, the only standard for determining this is the individual taste—that is, each man takes as the word of God that part of the Bible which he likes, or which appeals to him as true and helpful, or which does not greatly interfere with his personal opinions or desires, and the remainder he rejects; and this of course eventually means a different Bible for each person.

The next theory is one that is still more attenuated and is held by people who surely could not be called either

orthodox or liberal. This theory teaches that although the Bible is not the word of God in any general sense, though it does not contain the word of God in any special sense, yet somehow it is a different book from all the other books in the world, having a quality of inspiration about it that is unique, that sets it apart. These people feel a little shocked and troubled when you place the Bible on the same level with Shakespeare or Goethe and criticize it by precisely the same methods; that is, treat it simply as a human production. The best exponents of this theory are the majority of Unitarians, and men like the late Drs. Washington Gladden and Lyman Abbott. For instance, Dr. Gladden says in his book entitled, "How Much Is Left of the Old Doctrine?" after showing that the Bible is not the infallible word of God, "But I can imagine that some one may be saying, 'If all this is true, then the Bible is no more than any other book!' No, that does not follow. Between the two statements literally and verbally infallible and 'no more than any other book!' there is a long distance, and one can be far from the first without being anywhere near the second. . . . One may refuse to accept the traditional view of the Bible and still be very far from saying that it is reduced to the level of a purely human production." Of course, Dr. Gladden does not tell us what the Bible is, but that it is something between those two extremes; whereas I maintain that it must be one or the other.

## III

This brings us to the theory of genuine liberalism, which is the direct alternative of the theory of Verbal Inspiration —the one which treats the Bible as a purely human production, like any other natural human work. This theory recognizes all the good that is in it as good, and all the bad as bad; all the truth as truth, and all the error for what it is. It treats the book as a great body of religious and ethical literature very similar to the literature of other ancient peoples. It contains the mythology, the history, the biography, the poetry, the drama of the Hebrew people during a period of several centuries; and is not so different from any collection of other national literature collected over a similar period, except that it is predominantly religious because the Hebrews were an especially religious people. The liberal, in so far as it is possible, frees himself from all preconceptions in regard to the Bible, approaches it with the same open mind that he would approach any other collection of ancient literature, and in the study of it uses precisely the same canons of literary criticism that are used in the study of other literary productions. And when we approach the Bible in this man-

ner, we find as I have already intimated, that it is merely a collection of literature of every character, covering a period of six or seven centuries in the history of the Hebrews. It is divided into two divisions—the Old and the New Testaments. These two general divisions we find divided into many books, 39 in the Old Testament and 27 in the New Testament, making a library of 66 little volumes in all.

First among these we have what is known as the Pentateuch, commonly called the five books of Moses. They tell about the creation of the world, the origin and distribution of nations, the selection of one of these as the chosen people of God, how these wandered westward and finally became slaves in Egypt, how they escaped from this bondage into the wilderness where they wandered for 40 years, during which time the statutes of God were supposed to be given to them through Moses. Then come the books of Joshua and Judges, telling the story of the conquest and settlement in Canaan of these people. All of this we find to be a composite narrative based on older records long since lost, and is a strange mingling of mythology and what may be history. The Patriarchal figures which play an important role in these books are legendary and practically all the important narratives like that of the creation and of the flood are but Hebrew versions of a stock of primitive myths that were common to the Semitic races. After that we find a short story called Ruth, which, of course, is known to be pure fiction. Then follows an account of the founding of the kingdom of Israel, the history of the kings, the separation of the kingdom into two parts and the strife between them and with surrounding peoples. These are related to us in the books of Samuel, of Kings, and of Chronicles. These contain more history than the preceding books, but they also are strangely woven with myth and legend, as is all the history of this period, whether it be Babylonian, Greek, or Hebrew. Next in Ezra and Nehemiah we find the story of the captivity of the Hebrew people in Babylonia, their return and the rebuilding of the temple in Jerusalem—again a combination of history and legend. Then comes the story of Esther, and the drama of Job, dealing with the problem of human suffering from the standpoint of that period. After that, we find the hymnbook of the Jews, called the Psalms; followed by the Proverbs, a collection of wise sayings from anonymous sources. Next some poems, one called Ecclesiastes, a philosophical poem; and the other a beautiful oriental love-poem, called the Song of Solomon. Then come the four so-called major prohpets—Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiah and Daniel, followed by the twelve Minor prophets, beginning with Amos and ending with Habba-

kuk, which are simply fragmentary reports of the sermons of some of Israel's great preachers.

When we turn to the New Testament, we find first the four gospels, bearing the names of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, which are fragmentary sketches of the life of Jesus of Nazareth, compiled at least a half century after his death, which no doubt have some basis in fact, but are so interwoven with legend that it is difficult to say definitely how much, if any, is historical. The Acts, of similar character, tells about the founding of the Christian church. Then there are fourteen letters, supposed to have been written to these churches by Paul, answering their questions and advising them as to the solution of their many problems. There are several other letters bearing the name of James, John, Peter and Jude. Lastly comes the Apocalypse, the Revelation of St. John, in which he sets forth his vision of the second coming of Christ and the City of God, a book which is of no significance whatever except as an example of a kind of literature peculiar to that time, but which is made the basis for most of the fanaticism of the Fundamentalists about the second coming of the Lord.

## IV

Now it seems to me, after reviewing these various attitudes toward the Bible, that we have left only the alternative of accepting the Bible as the word of God, or as the word of Man—either it is of divine and supernatural origin or it is of human and natural origin. All this talk about it being a religious book, and correct in matters of religion and morals, while incorrect in matters of science and history, is simple nonsense. All this palaver about it as containing the truth of God mingled with the error of men, makes it an impossible book. And all this reverence for it as being purely human and yet something unique and worthy above all other literature, shows an absolute incapacity to judge values. The Bible is either the infallible word of God or it is the fallible word of men. A famous Fundamentalist says, "The very foundation of our faith, the very basis of our hopes, are taken from us when one line of that sacred volume, on which we base everything, is declared to be untruthful and untrustworthy." Fearful of losing the basis of their hopes, and unconscious apparently of their sublime egoism, the Fundamentalist reasons with logic—We must accept the whole or reject the whole.

I sometimes wonder, however, if the Fundamentalists have ever thought of this strange fact—that the Bible should be open to criticism at all, if it really be God's

revelation to mankind. How could God, having determined after aeons of time to make a definite revelation of himself to his human creatures, permit the account of this revelation to be handed down in such a haphazard fashion that future generations cannot be sure that they possess a reliable record? This, too, when a trustworthy record was the more essential on account of the miraculous nature of the narrative? Did not God know that a time would come when man should discover that nature's laws were not of the elastic character which our fathers had supposed? Did he not know, therefore, that we should require absolute proof before we could believe that they had been broken in an earlier and more credulous age? Instead of this, the only proofs afforded us are copies of documents, compiled of earlier and lost documents, and transmitted through centuries of time with extreme carelessness, having even been fraudulently manipulated by interested copyists. If ever special interferences with the course of nature were necessary, surely it is now, in the form of a miracle to prove the miracle on which our eternal destiny is staked. Or, if this be asking too much, if it be argued that God no longer breaks the laws which he has made, and that he now accomplishes his purposes by means of these laws only, how comes it that, for the safeguarding of this great truth, the most ordinary precautions have been neglected.

If you will pardon this way of putting it, I am only a poor human being with no more sympathy for suffering than the ordinary man; but if I were a being with infinite power and infinite wisdom and infinite mercy; if I were the supreme creator and ruler of this universe; if I had for my own pleasure created human beings who through no fault of mine even had brought about a condition which doomed them all to eternal torture; if I had invented a scheme by which they could be saved from this tragic destiny; and if I had revealed to them in written form what this scheme of salvation is, I would have written it in such language that no man could possibly mistake it, and I would have provided such means of preserving it that it would be as clear to the people of this twentieth century as it was to those of the first. And not only that, but if I had failed to do this, as God apparently has failed, I should make a new revelation in unmistakable terms, I should make it so clear and so universal that no man who had failed to take advantage of it could blame me either because he had not heard of it or because he did not understand it.

The Fundamentalists do not explain at all convincingly why the Almighty could not, or preferred not to make him-

self understood. If he could say, "Let there be light," he could also have said, "Let there be knowledge" so that men could have understood him. Or even having preferred to leave man ignorant and savage, could not an all-powerful God have devised some means of revealing himself so as to be understood; and why did he reveal himself only to a small tribe of people, and leave the rest of mankind in darkness? During the whole history of mankind people have been looking for God; and they ask us to believe that his grand revelation of himself is bound up in a volume of fables and errors collected thousands of years ago by superstitious priests and prophets of Palestine. I cannot believe such a thing. No man can believe it who tests it by his reason as he tests other modern problems. And if the leaders of religion brought the same mental processes to bear upon this problem as those which they use in settling other problems, they would not believe it either, if indeed they believe it now. Let any man, cast aside his preconceived notions about the Bible, approach it with an open mind, apply to it the scientific and historical method of study, and then consider it with the same fearless honesty and clear common sense with which he would consider any other book, and he will reach the conclusion that it is not the word of God to man, but a rather unique and interesting collection of tribal traditions and myths, compiled by men of genius and imagination.

## V

Before closing, I must add a word in a little different connection else some one will go away and say this is a purely destructive address. In the beginning, I said that Revelation was one of the fundamental ideas of religion, one which was common to all religions. What then is the thought of revelation held by Humanistic Liberalism? And what relation does it bear to the Bible? Humanism must have a much larger and broader Bible. It must be as much broader and larger than the Bible of Christianity, as its idea of God is broader and larger than the Christians' idea of God. If for Humanism, God is the spirit of humanity, then the Bible of Humanism can be no less than the revelation of that spirit of humanity in its fullness and in its purity. Therefore, all those books which reveal the spirit of man, and which therefore satisfy and inspire the common human mind and heart, constitute the Bible of Humanism, and nothing less than those can constitute it. Every true and noble thing that has ever been written form the real chapters of the eternal and human Bible that are being written age after age as the result of human discovery and experience—a Bible not yet

complete, for Humanism will never make the mistake of closing the canon, a Bible in which each new truth is a sentence, each new discovery a chapter, and that shall go on being written by the best and the highest elements in human life, so long as human life shall continue.

---

It is the custom to publish Mr. Dietrich's addresses in a series of ten numbers during the church year, one address each month being selected for that purpose. Many of these are out of print, but the titles listed below are still available and may be obtained by application in person or by mail to The Publication Committee, 803 LaSalle Ave., Minneapolis, at the price of 10 cents per copy.

The Business of a Church in These Days.
The Faith That Is in Us.
Forty Years of Truth Seeking.
Shall It Be Again?
The Plan to Outlaw War.
Westward of Forty-five—How to Grow Old.
The Human Thanksgiving.
The God of Evolution.
Liberal Religion at the Cross-Roads.
Robert G. Ingersoll—An Appreciation.
What and Why Is Christmas?
The General Break-up of Christianity.
The Failure of Protestantism.
The Meaning of Modernism.
Science and the Future of Man.
Can Human Nature Be Changed?
Christian Science and New Thought.
Religious Reaction and Fundamentalism.
Humanism—The Next Step in Religion.
The Ethics of Violence.
Orthodox Christianity or Evolution.
The Proofs of Evolution.
What the Bible Really Is.